

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\*\*\*

LUZ ELENA CUADROS, on behalf of herself  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

VS.

STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY  
COMPANY,

Defendant.

2:16-cv-02025-JCM-VCF

## ORDER

MOTIONS FOR LEAVE TO FILE UNDER SEAL (ECF NOS. 99 AND 105).

Before the Court is Plaintiff Luz Elena Cuadros' ("Plaintiff") Motion for Leave to File her Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery and all accompanying exhibits Under Seal (ECF No. 99) and her motion to file her Reply Memorandum In Support of Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery under seal. (ECF No. 105). For the reasons stated below, the motions are granted.

Plaintiff filed a motion to compel discovery in an action against State Farm Fire and Casualty Company (“Defendant”) on June 14, 2018. (ECF Nos. 100, 101). In support of this motion, Plaintiff attached exhibits classified as confidential under the protective order granted by the undersigned Magistrate Judge. (ECF No. 99). Additional confidential documents were attached to her reply. (ECF Nos. 106, 107).

The Ninth Circuit has emphasized a strong presumption in favor of access to court records and documents. *Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003). This general right to public documents, however, is not absolute. *Nixon v. Warner Commc'ns*, 435 U.S. 589, 598 (1978). The Court may allow a party to file a document under seal without redaction, pursuant to Fed. R.

1 Civ. P. 5.2(d). Local Rule IA 10-5 explains that a party may file a document with the court under seal if  
2 accompanied by a motion for leave to file those documents under seal.

3 A party seeking to seal documents in support of a non-dispositive motion must only show “good  
4 cause” exists to seal the documents in question. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d  
5 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006). When a court grants a protective order to seal discovery documents, “it  
6 already has determined that ‘good cause’ exists to protect this information from being disclosed to the  
7 public by balancing the needs for discovery against the needs for ‘confidentiality’.” *Phillips v. GMC*, 307  
8 F.3d 1206, 1213 (9th Cir. 2002). Because the motion to compel is not dispositive, and the approved  
9 stipulated protective order designates the documents in question as confidential, the good cause standard  
10 is met and Plaintiff’s motion to seal is granted.


11  
12 ACCORDINGLY, and for good cause shown,

13 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, that Plaintiff Luz Elena Cuadros’ Motion for Leave to File her Motion  
14 to Compel Discovery and all accompanying exhibits to her motion (ECF No. 99) is GRANTED.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave to File her Reply Memorandum In  
16 Support of Renewed Motion to Compel Discovery under seal (ECF No. 105) is GRANTED.

17 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that ECF Nos. 100, 107 shall remain under seal.

18  
19 DATED this 12th day of July, 2018.

20   
21 \_\_\_\_\_  
22 CAM FERENBACH  
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25